IPW

SEA ISLAND MARINE ENGINEERING, INC.
24 Escamacu Circle
St. Helena Island, SC 29920
Naval Architecture & Marine Engineering
Phone (843) 441-2000
roger@sime.us

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

June 27, 2007

Re: 10/679,534 dispute over denying claims that were previously accepted and following the course of action the Patent Office recommended and still not getting my patent awarded

Dear Mr. Lars Olson:

I have received your letter of 6/11/07 in response to my amendment dated 1/27/07. My patent has claims that are accepted by the Patent Office so I filed to have a patent awarded utilizing those claims, as they were stated. As we discussed, I wanted to move forward to get this patent awarded using those claims and to follow up by narrowing the claims of the patent that were too broad to be acceptable. You agreed that a patent could be awarded for the wing-in-ground effect hull. I am now dismayed and disturbed to receive notification that the claims cannot be accepted as written. Since I am not a patent attorney and I am not working with one I take exception to the course of action the Patent Office has chosen. As an individual I am afforded protection and assistance under the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure as follows:

In accordance with the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Section 707.07(j)
When, during the examination of a pro se [no attorney] case it becomes apparent to the examiner that there is patentable subject matter disclosed in the application [the examiner] shall draft one or more claims for the applicant and indicate in office action that such claims would be allowed if incorporated in the application by amendment.

This practice will expedite prosecution and offer a service to individual inventors not represented by a professional patent attorney or agent.

Although this practice may be desirable and is permissible in any case where deemed appropriate by the examiner, it will be expected to be applied in all cases where it is apparent that the applicant is unfamiliar with proper preparation and prosecution of patent applications.

In our last conversation you stated that, in your opinion, all of my claims would be acceptable if I added a qualifying phrase of "deep-vee bow" to the disqualified claims. As an example, an original disqualified claim is provided below with the amendment included and underlined:

Claims

1. A hull for conveyance across a fluid compromising:

   a) a central hull with a buoyant <u>deep-vee bow</u> section

   b) outboard chines which extend below said central hull providing a means to trap air, water, or a mixture of air and water, providing lift to the hull.